RYAN, PHILLIPS, UTRECHT & MACKINNON.

ATTORNEYS AT LAW

*NONLAWYER PARTNER

Aug 12 1 154 . 11 33

1133 CONNECTICUT AVENUE, N.W. SUITE 300

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20036

(202) 293-1177 FACSIMILE (202) 293-3411

August 12, 1999

Lawrence M. Noble, Esquire General Counsel Office of the General Counsel Federal Election Commission 999 E Street, NW 6th Floor Washington, DC 20463

Re: MUR 4911

Dear Mr. Noble:

Attached is the response of our clients, Gore 2000, Inc. and Jose Villerreal, as treasurer, Vice President Al Gore, and Mrs. Gore, in the above-captioned Matter Under Review. A designation of counsel statement has previously been filed for Gore 2000, Inc. and Jose Villerreal, as treasurer. Designation of counsel statements for Vice President Gore and Mrs. Gore will be forthcoming as soon as possible.

If you have any questions, please feel free to contact me.

Sincerely,

Eric F. Kleinfeld

Enc.

RYAN, PHILLIPS, UTRECHT & MACKINNON.

ATTORNEYS AT LAW

*NONLAWYER PARTNER

1133 CONNECTICUT AVENUE, N.W. SUITE 300

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20036

(202) 293-1177 FACSIMILE (202) 293-3411

August 12, 1999

Lawrence M. Noble, Esquire General Counsel Office of the General Counsel Federal Election Commission 999 E Street, NW 6th Floor Washington, DC 20463



Re: MUR 4911, Gore 2000, Inc. and Jose Villerreal, as Treasurer; Vice President Al Gore and Mrs. Gore

Dear Mr. Noble:

This is the response of our clients, Gore 2000, Inc. (the "Committee"), Vice President Al Gore and Mrs. Gore (collectively the "respondents"), in connection with the complaint filed in the above-captioned Matter Under Review ("MUR"). In short, this one-page, speculative complaint is completely devoid of any facts or detail by which even an allegation of a violation of the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971, as amended, of the Presidential Primary Matching Payment Account Act, (the "Acts") or of the Commission's regulations could be made. The Commission should immediately dismiss this baseless complaint and close this matter, as it pertains to the above-listed respondents.

This complaint fails to meet even the minimum standard required by the Commission for further consideration.

Under the Act and the Commission's regulations, a complaint to be sufficient, valid and appropriate for filing and consideration by the Commission must "conform" to certain provisions. Included in those provisions under 11 C.F.R. §111.4(d) are the following:

(2) Statements which are not based upon personal knowledge should be accompanied by an identification of the source of information which gives rise to the complainants belief in the truth of such statements;

- (3) It should contain a clear and concise recitation of the facts which describe a violation of a statute or regulation over which the Commission has jurisdiction; and
- (4) It should be accompanied by any documentation supporting the facts alleged if such documentation is known of, or available to, the complainant.

Quite simply, even a cursory reading of the complaint herein clearly reveals that it does not conform to any of these provisions, and for that reason alone should be rejected by the Commission. Merely swearing to unsubstantiated words on a single page of paper should not give rise to Commission consideration of a matter under review.

Contrary to the Commission's requirements, the complaint herein contains no indication of the source of any information pertaining to respondents. In fact, it contains no information at all pertaining to one of the respondents, Mrs. Gore, other than a listing of her name, yet the Commission chose to notify her nonetheless. As to the Vice President, complainant simply makes a bald assertion that he traveled to certain cities on campaign trips, ipso facto, there is some unnamed violation of law.

In addition, the complaint is accompanied by no documentation at all, despite the Commission's documentation requirement. Obviously, this complainant lacks personal knowledge of the travels of the Vice President and had to have come by these allegations from some source. Yet, the complaint is completely devoid of any such support. By the Commission's own regulation, the complainant must identify the source of that information, and he fails to do so. Accordingly, this complaint does not conform to the information and documentation provisions of 11 C.F.R. §111.4 and should be dismissed for that reason.

More importantly, the complaint does not recite any information which can be taken as "facts". Given that it is devoid of facts, it cannot constitute a recitation of anything describing a violation of the Acts. As indicated above, the complaint recites nothing pertaining to Mrs. Gore. Its only recitation pertaining to Gore 2000 and Vice President Gore are two simple sentences:

"Last week Mr. Gore went on campaign trips from Phil. to Pitts and then down to Tampa. One trip I thought was outrageous of him flying to LA, then to Orlando for a fundraising then next day flying back to LA." [sic]

Even if this information is considered a recitation of facts, they do not, under any conceivable reading, describe a violation of a statute or regulation under the Commission's jurisdiction. Contrary to the complainant's apparent premise, the Vice President is actually permitted to travel while a candidate for President, and he is

permitted to travel on campaign trips. In fact, he is permitted to travel on campaign fundraising trips. There can be no question that the two sentences above actually describe permissible activity by the Vice President, rather than an allegation of a possible violation, as is required by the Commission's regulations.

Something more is required for the Commission to consider these facts as giving rise to a possible violation. On their face, there is nothing wrong with these "facts", and they simply reflect the complainant's disapproval of the Vice President's travel. There is no express nor even implicit allegation -- other than gross speculation -- that the Committee did not pay for expenses related to these purported trips. Respondents should not be required to guess at or assume a potential violation that is not described in the complaint. Accordingly, this complaint does not conform to the recitation provisions of 11 C.F.R. §111.4 and should be dismissed for that reason.

Respondents have fully complied with the Commission's travel reimbursement regulations in connection with all trips on which campaign activity has occurred.

As set rorth above, complainant purports to describe two campaign trips taken by the Vice President. Neither is factually accurate. For purposes of demonstrating that this matter should be dismissed, however, respondents are providing the following information relating to recent trips taken by the Vice President which bear some similarity to the ones described by complainant.

"Last week Mr. Gore went on campaign trips from Phil. to Pitts and then down to Tampa." [sic]

This was in reality two trips:

1. Pittsburgh – Philadelphia

On June 28, 1999, the Committee held fundraising events in Philadelphia and Pittsburgh. The Vice President attended, traveling via Air Force II on a trip from Washington, DC to Pittsburgh to Philadelphia and returned home to Washington, DC. The Committee paid for the entire trip according to the reimbursement formula of §9034.7, including travel and in-flight food expenses. See Affidavit of Gary R. Gruver and Exhibit 1. Accordingly, complainant's allegations are without merit.

2. Tampa

On June 29, 1999, the Committee held a fundraising event in Tampa. The Vice President attended, traveling via Air Force II on a trip from Washington, DC to Miami to Tampa and returned home to Washington, DC. The Committee paid for the entire trip according to the reimbursement formula of §9034.7, including

As demonstrated below, while these two sentences do not accurately describe the trips actually taken by the Vice President, there were similar trips taken that were fully paid for by the Committee.

travel and in-flight food expenses. <u>See</u> Affidavit of Gary R. Gruver and Exhibit 2. Accordingly, complainant's allegations are without merit.

"One trip I thought was outrageous of him flying to LA, then to Orlando for a fundraising then next day flying back to LA." [sic]

This trip did not occur, as alleged.

3. Orlando

On May 24, 1999, the Committee held a fundraising event in Orlando. The Vice President attended, traveling via Air Force II on a trip from Washington, DC to Orlando and then on to Georgia and Texas, before returning home to Washington, DC. This trip did not originate in LA nor end up there. The Committee paid for the Orlando stop according to the reimbursement formula of §9034.7, including travel and in-flight food expenses. See Affidavit of Gary R. Gruver and Exhibit 3. Accordingly, complainant's allegations are without merit.

4. Los Angeles

As stated above and contrary to complainant's "facts", there was no travel to or from LA immediately prior to or after the travel to Orlando. In fact, the Vice President has made three trips to LA this year, though none in May, with the stops in LA paid for by the Committee in accordance with the reimbursement formula set forth in §9034.7. Accordingly, complainant's allegations are without merit.

All of these trips included stops at which campaign activity occurred.³ Pursuant to 11 C.F.R. §9034.7, the Committee has paid for the travel costs associated with the campaign stops in Pittsburgh, Philadelphia, Tampa and Orlando. The payment amounts have been calculated according to the hypothetical formula set forth in that regulation. These payments will be reflected on the Committee's Report of Receipts and Disbursements for the appropriate period in which the payments are made.

Accordingly, even if the complaint is generously read to include the allegation that campaign activity occurred on trips for which the Committee did not pay, such allegation is patently false.

It should be noted that the regulations governing the payment of travel expenses are the same ones as were in effect during the 1996 election cycle and applied by the Clinton/Gore '96 campaign. Neither the Exit Conference Memoranda nor the Final Audit Reports contained any issues pertaining to compliance with these reimbursement rules.

² The most recent stops in LA are in the process of being billed and will be paid for by the Committee at that time. However, there is no dispute that the Committee held events in LA and will be paying for these expenses.

³ The Vice President attended these events; Mrs. Gore -- though named as a respondent by the Commission -- did not attend.

The Committee is following the same practice and procedure as was implemented in 1996 in order to comply with these rules, and Committee records -- including travel payments for the use of Air Force II -- are expected to be audited by the Commission as part of the routine audit conducted as a result of the acceptance of matching fund payments. Contrary to the unsupported and speculative assertions in the complaint, there is absolutely no evidence or information to suggest that the Committee has deviated from the required reimbursements.

Consequently, even assuming that complainant is describing actual trips of the Committee and its candidate, those trips were fully paid for -- or in the process of being paid for -- by the Committee. The Committee is not asserting otherwise. Given that there is no dispute as to the Committee's payment obligation, the Commission should find that there is no reason to believe that a violation of the Acts occurred, dismiss this complaint and close this matter as it pertains to these respondents.

Conclusion

hu Fellenfeld_ Eric Kleinfeld

In conclusion, the complaint filed herein is completely devoid of any factual basis for the Commission to find reason to believe that a violation of the Acts or Commission regulations occurred. As demonstrated above, the scant facts contained in the complaint are speculative and completely erroneous and cannot serve as the basis for any Commission finding. Given that the Committee has complied with the provisions of the Commission's travel reimbursement regulations, insofar as the complaint can be read to raise an allegation connected thereto, this matter should be dismissed and closed immediately.

Respectfully submitted,

Lyn Utrecht

AFFIDAVIT OF GARY R. GRUVER

- I, Gary R. Gruver, hereby declare the following:
- 1. I am the Director of Travel for Gore 2000, Inc. (the "Committee").
- 2. Among my various duties, I am responsible for the processing and payment of all bills relating to travel to and from Committee events, in accordance with the provisions of the Commission's regulations at 11 C.F.R §9034.7.
- 3. I have attached true and accurate copies of the Committee's payments for travel and in-flight food expenses for campaign stops in Pittsburgh, Philadelphia, Tampa, and Orlando hereto.

Executed on this //// day of August, 1999.

IN WITNESS WHEREOF, I have hereunto set my hand and official seal.

Notary Public

My commission expires on:

Ada O. Kirk, Notary Public District of Columbia

Commission Expire 6/14/02

Exhibit 1

28333 TRX DESCRIPTION: Airfare Expenses

7,989.00

\$7,989.00

GORE 2000 INC. P.O. BOX 18127 WASHINGTON, DC 20038 (202) 263-6000

NATIONSBANK National Berlin, N.A. ACH FI/T 054001204 15-120/540 DC 0213

08/04/99

0004036 NUMBER

PAY:

TO THE

OF:

A NATA

T M

ä

********** OOLLARS AND OO CENTS

ORDER White House Airlift Operations OFOR

Room 265

Washington \mathfrak{DC} 20501 DATE

AMOUNT

*******7,989,00

NOW-NEGATIABLE

TWO SIGNATURES REQUIRED IF CVER 2,000,00

TRX DESCRIPTION: Airfare/Rail

34.05

\$34.05

GORE 2000 INC. P.O. BOX 18127 WASHINGTON, DC 20038 (202) 263-6000

Negotabank, N.A. ACH RVT 054001204 15-120/540 DC 0213

NUMBER

PAY:

m 1

************ DOLLARS AND 05 CENTS

TO THE

ORDER OF:

OEOB Room 265 Washington

DC 20501

White House Airlift Operations

DATE

08/04/99

THUOMA

20.4Exxxxxxxxx

TWO SIGNATURES REQUIRED IF OVER 2,000.00

m004035m ::02400150r: 00141r14f4r4m

Exhibit 2



44.32

07/27/99 28330 TRX DESCRIPTION: Inglight Expenses

\$44.32

0004094



GORE 2000 INC. P.O. BOX 18127 WASHINGTON, DC 20036 (202) 263-8000

MATTOMEDANIK Nedonišerik, N.A. ACH RIT (B4001804 15-120/540 DC 0£13

NUMBER

PAY:

M

r O M

推

DATE

AMOUNT

08/09/99

SE。\$P\$水水水水水水水

TO THE

OF:

ORDER

White House Airlift Operations

DEOB

Room 265

Washington DC 20501

TWO SIGNATURES REQUIRED IF OVER 2,000,00

POOLO94P #054001204# QO1914191949P

28331

07/27/99 TRX DESCRIPTION: Airfare/Rail

7,440.00

\$7,440.00

GORE 2000 INC. P.O. BOX 18127 WASHINGTON, DC 20038 (202) 283-6000

NATIONEBANK Negrabera, N.A. ACH PVT 064801804 16-120/840 DO 0218

0004095

NUMBER

PAY:

7.7 M

(I)

M 3

j

3

ſЩ

DATE

AMOUNT

********7,440 DOLLARS AND OO CENTS

08/09/99

の2.00・00・00 かな水水水水水

TO THE

ORDER

OF:

White House Airlift Operations

DEOB

Room 265

Washington 20501 DC

"004095" ::054001204: 001914191949"

3250

20,987.00

27355

\$20,987.00

GORE 2000 INC. P.O. SOX 18127 WASHINGTON, DC 20036 (202) 263-6000

HINDORGENIL N.A. ACH FVT 084001204 15-120/540 DC 0213

NUMBER

l'i

U M

PAY:

DATE

AMOUNT

*******20,987 DOLLARS AND OO CENTS

06/30/99

\$**************20,987.00

TO THE

ORDER OF:

White House Airlift Operations OEOB

Room 265

Washington

20501 DC

TWO SIGNATURES REQUIRED IF OVER 2,000,00

184.79

3317

\$184.79

GORE 2000 INC. P.O. BOX 18127 WASHINGTON, DC 20038 (202) 263-6000

NATIONSTANK NazionaBarak, N.A. ACH PVT 054001204 15-120/540 DC 0213

NUMBER

M

M

1 Ţ, M

R

33

j

ħΩ

PAY:

TO THE

ORDER

OF.

White House Airlift Operations OEOB

Room 265

Washington

0020501 DATE

06/30/99

AMOUNT

*********184.79

TWO SIGNATURES REQUIRED IF OVER 2,000,00

#003317# #1054001204# 001914191949#

\$622.14



GORE 2000 INC. P.O. BOX 18127 WASHINGTON, DC 20038 (202) 263-6000 NATIONS BANK NESCEBERA NA ACH RIT 054201224 15-120/540 OC 0213 0003318

NUMBER

DATE

AMOUNT

06/30/99

\$********622.14

O THE

内 可 可 PAY:

t O

White House Airlift Operations OEOB

UEUE

Room 265

Washington DC 20501

TWO SIGNATURES REQUIRED IF OVER 2,000,00

%OD3318% %OS4001504% QO14177414744%